The INTEREST OF The English Nation

Under the Happy Government OF

King William III.

Once more Asserted:

In ANSWER to the

Challenge of a Jacobite.

WHEREIN IS PROVED

That that Law which forbids taking up Arms against the King upon any Pretence whatsoever, is Consistent with the late Revolution.

By *Philo-Kalo-Basileos.*

If we take the whole People as one Body and Mass, then as the Head is ordained for the Body, and not the Body for the Head; so must a Righteous King know himself ordained for his People, and not his People for him. King *James* I. his Speech to both Houses of Parliament, *March* 19. 1603.

London, Printed and are to be Sold by *E. Whitlock*, near *Stationers Hall*, by *Amen-Corner*. 1696.

The PREFACE.

EVer since our Glorious Monarch King William *came to the Crown, I have made it my Business upon all occasions to the utmost of my Power and Capacity, to Assert his Interest, and to set forth the Happiness of these Kingdoms, together with my own Unspeakable Satisfaction under his Government.*——*To this purpose I have written several Papers, some of which were lost in the Crowd, when they were by Learned Hands recommended to the Publick, and others have been neglected, and thrown aside as inconsiderable; and yet for all that I am not discouraged: For I find so much Pleasure in the Cause* I *am Defending, and such Refreshment in diverting my self with Political Reflections in this Auspicious Reign, that however I may fail in the Management, I shall never be Deficient in my Zeal and Hearty Endeavours to Support and Maintain the present Government.*

Amongst the rest, the following Discourse, together with the Vindication thereof, was extorted from me by the insolent Prating, and undecent Scribling of certain Jacobites, *one of which would needs urge upon me the following Case, which he presumed to be such a Capping Question as no Body could Answer. I say it was extorted from me at that Time, being unwilling to engage in a Debate with my Neighbours; and having besides other things under Consideration. For though such Rencounters are a Pleasure and Diversion to me, at a proper Season, yet when other Business is before me, or when my Mind is Cloudy, I am willing enough to leave these Debates to better Hands; being sensible that what is mean at best, must be yet meaner under such Circumstances. Upon which account the* Reader *will not find here so even a Thread of Discourse, as might be Expected. But that I little value, not seeking my own Credit, but the Security of the Government.*

Had I begun to write about the Discovery of the Plot, it might perhaps have sharpened the Dulness of my Pen, and inspir'd a Creeping Style with Life and Vigour; but I was not so happily Tim'd. And even now when the Snare is broken, it is a better Season for Rejoycing and Thanksgiving, than for Satyr and Invective: For the Jacobites *have left us nothing to say; their Actions strike us Dumb; and their Bloody Designs cry so loud, that nothing can be heard. They have indeed been sufficiently ex-*

posed already, but this Plot has painted them more Black and Monstrous, more Loathsome and Abominable than any thing that has been said, or could be thought of heretofore. And if Oldham *were alive again, he would be confounded with the Subject, and not know where to begin his Satyr. They are a Generation Prostigate and Absurd beyond the Examples of former Ages, and made up of such Heterogeneous Stuff, that they are perfectly Unaccountable. But may they never succeed better in their Plotting, and we shall the better forgive them; especially since Vengeance is waiting for them, and Providence seems abhorrent of their Villany. And since they have left the Church because a Protestant King is there Prayed for, it is but* Decorum, *that they should Reform their Devotions, and, to their Prayers for K.* James, *add this for themselves,*

Vos O mihi manes,
Este boni, quoniam superis aversa Voluntas.

After all, it is to be hoped, that the Jacobites *will divide their Forces; and some that have not yet made Shipwrack of Shame and Modesty, may come over to our Party; others will be for making Apologies, endeavouring to shift the Odium of the Plot off from themselves; others may grow desperate, if they think fit, and rage like the Devil, when he has but a short time to reign; and some will fret and fry in their own Grease, like a certain Brother of theirs, mentioned by the Poet,*

Qui Centum vinctus aheneis,
Post tergum nodis, fremet horridus ore Cruento.

But I now leave them, either to the Gallows, or at least the Discipline of their own wicked Minds, and the secret Lashes of an Evil Conscience.

Occultum quatiente animo tortore flagellum.

The

THE Challenge of a Jacobite ANSWERED.

Which was to ſhew, *How that Law which forbids taking Arms againſt the King upon any Pretence whatſoever, is Conſiſtent with the late Revolution.*

IN the firſt place, I lay down this for a Foundation, That General Rules have, for the moſt part, ſome tacit Exception, which muſt of neceſſity be underſtood, tho' not expreſſed: And this is more eſpecially ſo, when the nature of the thing is ſuch, that the Exception ought not to be made, nor can be mentioned without great Inconvenience.

Now two things I am obliged to do in this matter; firſt, I ſhall give ſeveral plain and undeniable Inſtances, to evince the Truth of what I have here laid down: And ſecondly, I ſhall give Reaſons to ſhew that it ought to be ſo in the Caſe before us.

1. *Yet forty days, and Nineveh ſhall be overthrown*, Jonah 3. 4. This is poſitive and abſolute; yet here is to be underſtood, *Except they Repent.*

2. *Children obey your Parents in all things*, Epheſ. 6. 1. Yet if they command ſinful things, I muſt not obey them.

3. Wives are commanded in Scripture to *be ſubject to their Husbands in all things*, without any Exception mentioned; yet ſtill we muſt except ſinful Commands.

4. Marriage obliges the Parties to live together till Death part them;

them; but Adultery may part them ſooner, and that Legally too.

5. *Thou ſhalt not ſteal:* This is ſpoken without any explicit Reſervation; and yet Caluiſts tell us, That in Caſes of extream hunger, and peril of Starving, and being deny'd all manner of Relief, a Man may take where he can come to it, any thing to eat or drink, for the preſervation of Life. But after the ſtrictneſs of this Precept, even the plucking Ears of Corn and eating them, in another Mans Field, is plain Stealing.

Now as on the one hand, both Scripture and Reaſon will juſtifie theſe Exceptions; ſo on the other ſide, there is all the reaſon in the World why they ſhould not be expreſſed: For if *Jonah* had preached to the *Ninevites*, That they ſhould be deſtroyed in forty days, if they repented not; it's very like they would have delayed their Repentance: But the Terror of a Peremptory Doom wrought more effectually.

If Children and Wives had been commanded Obedience with a Reſerve, it would have implied that Husbands and Parents might prove ſo wicked as to command them ſinful things, which ought not to be ſuppoſed: And then ill-diſpoſed Children might diſobey upon ſlight occaſions, and fancy all ſuch Commands to be unjuſt, as they had not a mind to obſerve.

If Marriage did oblige the Parties to live together till Death or Adultery ſhould make a Separation, and that it were ſo expreſſed in the Office; this would be an odious and ſhameful Inſinuation, that one or both of them might prove ſo wicked, as to give occaſion of Divorce.

And if the Law had ſaid, Thou ſhalt not ſteal, without extream Neceſſity; this would have been taken for little leſs than a Licenſe toſteal, every one judging for himſelf of his own Neceſſity.

Thus we may ſee how natural it is for General Words to carry along with them, a reſerved Condition or Limitation, which yet ought by no means to be Mentioned or Expreſſed. And thus it is in the Caſe before us: For if the Law had Said, *Thou ſhalt not take Arms againſt the King upon any pretence whatſoever, Except the King deſignes to Subvert the Goverment*, This would have been a Diſloyal Intimation, that the King might prove a Tyrant; and would have given Incouragment to the people to Suſpect his Intentions;

tions; and many times, without any Cauſe, to Cenſure his Actions; Yet, that thus it muſt be Underſtood, will Appear by the Reaſons Following.

1. The firſt is this, That if it be Underſtood in the Utmoſt Force and Latitude that the words will bear, it makes Void all other Laws; nay even the Law of God cannot ſtand in its way. If you take it by the wrong handle, it will be ſo ill Condition'd as to Suffer no Law but it Self. The deſign of the Law is to ſecure to Every Man his Right. It is by Law that we attend our Callings, that we Eat and Sleep in quietneſs, that we Enjoy what we Call our Own, that we can ſerve God in Peace, and that our Churches are not turned into Idol-Temples. But now if we muſt upon no account whatſoever defend theſe Rights when they are Invaded, what benefit have we by the Law? Or to what End ſerves it? If we muſt upon no pretence whatſoever, even at the utmoſt Extremity, reſiſt the Illegal Proceedings of the Prince, then is the whole Law of *England* no more but Sham; and whatſoever we have, we enjoy it only at the Kings diſcretion, and during his pleaſure: Nay all the Societies of men in *England*, are no more but as ſo many Herds of Cattel to Labour for the Uſe, and to be ſlaughtered at the pleaſure of the King. So that either we muſt qualifie that Article of the Law, or give up all the reſt.

2. There is a difference (as all men know) between the power of *Making* Laws, and the power of *Executing* the ſame; the latter reſts intirely in the King, but not the former. Now with reſpect to the Executive power, we yield (if that will pleaſe our Adverſaries) That the King is not to be reſiſted, upon any pretence whatſoever; Whilſt he is Executing the Law, no man may ſay unto him *What doeſt thou?* Whatever colour there may be of male-adminiſtration, that can be no Juſt ground of Reſiſtance, becauſe the Law provides a remedy, and the Miniſters muſt Anſwer for it. But then, this can never be Extended to the Legiſlative Power, unleſs you will ſuppoſe that the Parliment when they made that Law, intended not only to Cancel all the reſt, but never to make any more. This had been a final Diſſolution of all Parliaments, and of the Goverment it ſelf: It had put all into the Kings hands, and made him Arbitrary by a Law. As if they had Enacted, *Let the King*

King henceforward make Laws without a Parliament, Let him pull down the Church and set up an Idol, Let him Alienate his Kingdom, and sell his People for Slaves, or any thing else, what he pleases: Nay, if he be seiz'd with a Phrenzy, and Kill the People about him, he is not to be resisted, upon any pretence whatsoever. And if he should Attempt to kill himself, there is no means of prevention, no touching him, no laying hands upon him, tho' it be for his Safety: See what Extremity and Absurdity this Doctrine of our Adversaries leads to! But if they will admitt of an Accommodation, we are Content to Divide the Truth, and let them take one half, but we will never yield the other. The King then in Executing the Laws made according to the Constitution of the Government, is not to be resisted on any Account whatsoever: But if they will have the King to make Laws by himself, and do what he pleases without Resistance, they talk without book, and will never be Convinced till they are going to the Gallows, or to a Stake.

3. The King, being no more than a Man, cannot do much harm by his own proper strength; so that supposing him to be a Tyrant, I never can fear that he will come in Person and take away my Life or Estate: He must then act by Commissioners. Now these Commissioners must be duly qualified persons, and rightly Commissioned according to Law, to do some legal Act. Coming then under these Circumstances, they are God's Ministers to me for my Good; in resisting them, I resist the Ordinance of God, and must expect Damnation and Judgment, for so doing. And here again I suppose the *Jacobites* and I are perfectly Agreed. But what if these pretended Commissioners should happen to be Papists, French Dragoons, or Rapparees, and came without any legal Commission, to Robb me, by vertue of a Writing, which they call a Commission, under the Kings Hand and Seal, what then? Why truly then I might happen to be Robb'd or Murdered. And what say our Self-denying Adversaries to this? They say I must patiently suffer and submit; for tho' these persons be not qualified according to Law, yet they Act according to the King's pleasure, and I must lie at their Feet; Yes, so I would, if I could not help it: But so would I do at the Feet of High-way-men, and from them I should find more Mercy. Thieves and Robbers spoil some particular Persons:

persons: But these are the Villains that destroy Government. Were it not for these, the King could do no harm: They are Devouring Beasts, and Savage Monsters broken loose, and ought to be treated accordingly.

4. I shall add in the 4th place, That the King of *England* is King by Law, it is by Law that he wears a Crown, and is cloathed with Royal Power: But if he Subverts the Foundation of the Government, he takes away the Foot he stands upon; he destroys his own Authority, and Ceases to be a King; He is then but like *Robin-hood*, an Out-law: For a King without Law, Implies a Contradiction. The Matter then in short is this; The King Executing the Law, is not to be resisted upon any pretence whatsoever; but if he lay aside the Law, and become Arbitrary, He divests himself of his Crown and Dignity, and is no longer a King.

But because our Adversaries will storm heavily at this Saying, how Undeniable soever it be, let us see if we can Strengthen it by Authority; And first, That of a Wise and Learned King, *viz. James* the First, who in a Speech before the Parliament, 1609. has these words. *A King Governing in a Setled Kingdom, leaves to be a King, and Degenerates into a Tyrant, as soon as he leaves off to Rule according to his Laws: And they that perswade them the Contrary, are Vipers and Pests, both against them and the Commonwealth.* So that it seems a King may fall from his Power, and cease to be a King; and he actually does so, when he leaves off to Rule according to his Laws. Let us now see what the force of Truth has Extorted from a Learned Man of our Adversaries Party, a Mighty Asserter of Monarchical Power, the Famous *Barclay*. *Two Cases*, he saies, *there are, whereby a King, ipso facto, becomes no King, and loses all power and Regal Authority over his people, for he divests himself of his Royal Crown and Dignity, he returns to the state of a private Man, and the People become free and Superiour.* All the words in the Dictionary cannot cut deeper than these, nor kill the Cause more Dead upon the Spott: to Add any thing, would be Subtraction; and to offer at Illustration would be to darken. I shall only mention his two Cases, and leave it. The first is, *If the King Endeavour to overturn the Government, and have a purpose and Design to ruin the Kingdom and Common-wealth.* The Second is, *If he make himself the Dependant of another, and betray his people into the Power*

and *Dominion of a foreign Nation.* These two Cases are both so like ours of Late, that one would think this Author had written by Inspiration: And the best of all is, he is taken for an Enemy, which makes his Testimony on our sides the more Considerable.

By this time I think it may appear, that *Non-resistance* is not to be taken in the rigid and inflexible Sence of our Adversaries; but so qualified as to let the English Frame and Constitution of Government stand where it is. But there is nothing, almost, which may not be Spoiled by overdoing: Nothing better in a well-settled Government than *Obedience*; but once misplaced, there's nothing worse. This is that which had it been Universal, had left nothing ere this day, but Grief and Lamentation, Chains and Slavery, Superstition and Idolatry, for which Posterity might have had cause to Curse the Servile Baseness of the present Generation, had not K. *William*, and many Noble *English-men*, stood in the Gapp, to Save the Nation from Sudden Ruine, and from a Sad Character in after times.

Now let our Adversaries stand still a little, and Consider whether they be not *righteous overmuch Eccl.* 7.16. And whether they do not make themselves over-wise. I would as soon pass my word for Wisdom and Righteousness, that they should not be Capable of Excess, as any thing Else that I can think of: And yet even in that Case the wisest of Kings thought a caution Necessary. And this is the Character of those men we have to deal with; they will be wiser than the Publick Wisdom of the Nation; and more Righteous than the whole Church whereof they profess to be Members.

I very well remember the time when these Men, above others, were Continually Charging the Dissenters with Pride and Self-Conceit, with wilful Obstinacy, with Faction and Disobedience; some could find nothing Else to Preach on, and others made it their common Discourse; and now, *out of their own mouths they are Justly Condemn'd.* Some Dissenters indeed have some needless Scruples about *Ceremonies*; but These only scruple *Deliverance*; and to be Saved from Ruine and Misery, lies heavy upon their *Consciences.* They pay *Faith* and *Allegiance* to a *Tyrant*, or a *Non-Ens*; and they return *Malice* and *Ignominy* for *Security* and *Protection.*

I shall conclude this matter with a Sentence taken from a very learned Pen, which also has been asserted by others; Namely, *That when a Prince breaks in upon the Religion and Liberties of his People, they ought to stand up in their own Defence, and may also call in a Neighbour, or Forreigner to their Assistance.* And this very thing has been Declared Lawful by Queen *Elizabeth*, by K. *James* the first, by K. *Charles* the first, with their Parliaments; and by Arch Bishop *Laud* into the Bargain, as may be further made Evident upon occasion.

And here I thought to have made an End; But I find our Adversaries, when other reasons fail them, betake themselves to the Bible, wherein they think to find their Unlimitted *Power* and passive *Obedience*. I cannot pretend to Remember all those passages of Scripture, which they have Press'd for this Service; but two or three of the more remarkable, I shall Endeavour at present to Release from the Unnatural force and Violence put upon them, and the rest as I meet with them.

First Prov. 30. 31. *A King against whom there is no rising up.* I grant it, in the Sence afore-mentioned: That is, So long as he remains a *King*, and Keeps the Laws, he is a *Rebel* that oppose him: But when he falls from that, he is a *Rebel* himself. I speak not this at Random, but I'll make it good. The first *King* of *Israel* was a *Rebel*, if you will believe the Prophet *Samuel*: For he plainly Charges him with *Rebellion*. *Behold* (saies he) *to obey is better than Sacrifice, and to harken than the fat of Rams: For Rebellion is as the Sin of Witchcraft &c.* 1. Sam. 15. 22.

God had given a Command to *Saul*, that he should Smite *Amaleck* and Destroy utterly all that they had. This was the Law he was to observe: But he disobeyed it, and thereupon the Prophet not only gives him a severe Reprimand, but *Saul* left his Kingdom beside. After this, *David* was so far from *Nonresistance*, that he Armed himself in his own Defence, and about 600 Men. And he Seiz'd upon Strong-holds at *Engedi*. 'Tis true, *David would not Kill him Cowardly*, which was a Noble and brave Example, but had he met him fairly in the Field, no doubt but he would have Fought him. He gave him at one time such a Lecture as made him fall a weeping: At another time he preach'd to him from the

top of an Hill, so long till *Saul* Prophesied *David's* Success, and the ruine of his own Kingdom. *Thou shalt both do great things, and also shalt prevail.* 1.Sam.26.25. Now all this being done by *David* in a posture of Defence, and probably with *Goliah's* Sword in his hand, amounts sufficiently to a Rising up against *Saul*, and Consequently that these words are not to be taken Strictly, but in such a qualified sence as may comport with other parts of Scripture, as will further appear by considering another Text here following, *Eccles.*8. 4. *Who may say unto a King what doest thou?*

With the former Scripture our Adversaries would bind our hands, and with this they would tye our tongues: The one must deprive us of Self Defence, and the other of the Liberty of Speech. It is not Enough to Suffer unjustly and to be destroyed, but it is a Crime to Complain, or to represent our Grievances. How unlike are some *Earthly Gods* to the *God* of *Heaven*, whose Authority they have, and whom they ought to Resemble! He invites, nay he Commands us to petition him for what we want. They Cannot bear to be petition'd at all, but call it *Rebellion.* He will not suffer us to be tempted beyond what we are able to bear: They will take our Fields and Vineyards, make us Slaves and Beggars, and we may not enquire the reason.

En quo discordia Cives
Perduxit miseros! En quæis consevimus agros?

Such was the Effect of Court Flattery, that none must look into the Kings Measures, nor dare to ask a Question: None must admonish him of Danger, reprove him of Evil, nor advise him for Good; for *who may say unto him, What doest thou? Counsellors* and *Chaplains* (at this rate) must all take their leave, there's no occasion or business for them. This indeed was lately our Case, and thus our Adversaries would have it still.

But by their Favour, as the Case is now (God be praised) happily altered, so neither is this the intent of the Text, it being only an Emphatical Expression to shew the Greatness of a Kings Power, and how insolent a thing it is, to question him in the just Exercise of his Regal Authority, whilst he is Executing the *Laws* of his

Coun-

Country, for the punishment of Evil Doers, and for the Praise of them that Do Well, why should any one oppose him? But if he be setting Fire to a City, subverting his Government, betraying his People, or destroying himself: One need not ask indeed what he is a doing, for the thing speaks it self; He is throwing off his *Crown* and *Dignity*, and Resistance is the only way to keep it on. This should be endeavoured with all the respect to a Crowned Head, that the matter will bear; but if Force be necessary, it must be used. They are good Subjects that prevent their *King*'s falling down a Precipice tho' it be by violent Hands; but they are *Traytors*, who out of Respect and Reverence will let him break his Neck. And we have the Authority of King *James* the First, and of the Learned *Barclay*, *That where a* King *has no Authority, there he ceases to be* King, *and returns to the state of a private* Man. But call him *King* still, if you please, it is however the Duty of his *Council*, and those about him, who have opportunity, to admonish him of Danger, and prevent his Ruine as far as they can, before it be too late. And perhaps the mis-applying of this very Text, may have made some Men over-Cautious, and deprived *Kings* of that free and wholesome Advice which might have been greatly serviceable to them.

Let us now look into the Scriptures, and see whether what has been said to *Kings* in former times, may not seem to counter-ballance this Interrogative, *What doest thou?* *Samuel* told *King Saul*, he *had done foolishly*, and charges him with Disobedience, Stubbornness, and Rebellion. *Elijah* told *King Ahab*, That *he had sold himself to do evil in the sight of the Lord*, and that it was *he and his Fathers House that troubled Israel.* These are Reproofs to the purpose, and certainly of no less importance than to say, *What doest thou?* Now it is to be supposed that God would inspire his *Prophets* to speak such words to their *Kings*, as were not fit to be spoken by others upon the like Occasion? So that I conclude, this Text hinders not at all, but that a *King* pulling down the *Church* and the *Law*, and setting up *Superstition*, *Idolatry*, and *Arbitrary Power*, may be questioned and gainsaid by his Council, and resisted too, by the Majority of the Nation.

Another Text, which is wont to be urged for the Power and Sa-

credness

troulness of *Kings*, is *Prov.* 8. 15. *By me Kings reign, and Princes decree Justice*: But I never hear them read the Context, *by me Princes rule, and Nobles, even all the Judges of the Earth*: And good reason, for this would prove too much, and more than they would have, namely, that *Judges* are *Jure Divino*, as well as *Kings*; for by the same *Logick* that the one is inferred from the 15th Verse, the other will follow from the 16th Verse; I challenge any one to shew me the difference. This would have been strange Doctrine in the late *Reign*, when *Durante Beneplacito* came into fashion, and *Judges* were turn'd out for doing Right.

But I do not see how either of the two can be proved from this Scripture: For who is this *Me*, and this *I*, mentioned here in my Text? It is not *Solomon*, for vers. 23. *I was set up from Everlasting*. Nor is it *God* himself, for at Vers. 22. he says, *The Lord possessed me in the beginning*. But it is *Wisdom* which is here spoken of, and which *Solomon* personates all along, speaking in the first Person, from Verse the 12th to the end of the Chapter; and setting forth the Nature and Excellency, the Power and Advantages of *Wisdom*; *I Wisdom dwell with Prudence, &c.* and a little after, *By me Kings reign*, &c. So then the plain meaning of the Text is this, That *Kings* reign by *Wisdom*, and that *Nobles* and *Judges*, who have the Administration of Publick Affairs, are qualified by *Wisdom* to manage the great Concerns and Business of a *Kingdom*; And tho' all *Kings* and *Ministers* of State are not thus qualified (which is the Cause of many short and unfortunate Reigns) yet here we are taught what it is that qualifies them for *Government*, and that *Wisdom* is to be sought by them more than fine *Silver*, and *Knowledge* rather than choice *Gold*. If this Lesson had been well learned by our late Kings, *England* had been a flourishing Nation at this day, and might perhaps have given *Laws* to the *Christian World*.

By this time our Adversaries will be ready to demand, after their scoffing manner, When is it time for the People to *Rebel*? And who must judge between them and their *King*? To this I shall answer, after I have made an Observation about the word *Rebel*, or *Rebellion*.

It has been oft observed by Learned Men, that the Scripture condescending to humane Capacity, uses such Forms of Speech as are com-

common among Men, tho' the same are not to be taken in a strict and proper sence. Thus it is said *God made two great Lights, the one to Rule the Day, the other to Rule the Night*; whereas it is certain that the *Moon* has no more light in it self than a Stone-Wall; only it shines by reflecting to us that borrowed Light it receives from the *Sun*. So when a People Arm themselves against their *King*, it is very obvious to call it *Rebellion*, tho their Cause be never so just; And it seems to me, that the Scripture in sundry places speaks after the same manner, calling that *Rebellion*, which strictly and properly is not so, or which at least is not *Rebellion* in a Criminal Sense.

This perhaps may seem strange to some People; but let them impartially consider 1 *Kings* 12. 19. where it is said, *Israel rebelled against the House of David unto this Day*: And to this Day they were never reproved for it; and good reason, *For this thing is from Me, saith the Lord*, by the Prophet *Shemaiah*, vers. 24. Nor can we call this a bare Permission, but it was Determined before-hand, and a Prophet sent to *Jeroboam* to give him Notice of it, *Behold I will rend the Kingdom out of the hand of* Solomon, *and will give Ten Tribes to thee*, 1 Kings 11. 31. And why should God do this? *Because*, says he, *they have forsaken me and worshipped Idols*, &c. So that here is a peremptory Decree for this Defection, with the Reason annexed, and God ordered second Causes so as to bring it about. Learned Men may dispute, if they please, whether the Ten Tribes were free Agents in what they did; it is evident from the Text, That this Revolt of theirs was the Purpose and Design of *God*, and was approved by him, tho' it is called in Scripture *Rebellion*.

Another Instance of this kind we have in 2 *Kings* 18. 7. where it is said of *Hezekiah*, That *he rebelled against the King of Assyria*. Was *Hezekiah* an Offender in this? No, *for the Lord was with him*. Whatever Promises or Covenants had passed between him and the King of *Assyria*, we know not: This is certain, That King *Hezekiah* did well in throwing off the *Assyrian* Yoke, tho' it hath the name of Rebellion; *for he clave to the Lord and departed not from following him, but kept his commandments. So that after him was none like him among all the Kings* of *Judah*, nor any *that were before him*. Behold here a Sinless Rebellion, which was the thing I aim'd

at;

at; and now let the *Jacobites* call us *Rebells* or what Elſe they pleaſe.

I ſhall now proceed to give my Anſwer, when it is time to *Rebel*: having firſt declared when it is not time. It is not to fly to *Arms* for ſome few private Injuries done to particular perſons, whilſt Law has its due Courſe in the Main, and the Vital parts of *Government* remain ſafe. Indeed people are ſeldom forward to hazard their own Lives and Fortunes to Revenge private wrongs. Nor yet ought they to Embroil a *Kingdom* for ſome publick Miſcarriages of the *King*, when it may be reaſonably ſuppoſ'd, that he hath Us'd his Prerogative for the good of his people, to the beſt of his Judgment, tho' in Effect it hath proved Contrary. What is well meant, and will afford a tollerable reaſon, ſhould be forgiven, notwithſtanding the ill Conſequence, when it is not wilfully perſiſted in. There is a time for Prayers as well as for Self-defence, and that ſhould be try'd in the firſt place; and ſo long as any hope remains, it is a proper Seaſon for Faith and Patience.

But when the *Kings* Illegal Proceedings have Extended one way or other to the Majority of the People, and from particular injuries have advanced to an invaſion upon all mens *Liberties*; When the Violence that has affected many, is of ſuch a Nature and Conſequence as to threaten All; When High-Commiſſion-Courts are ſet up to diſſeiz Men of their *Free-holds*, and *Charters* call'd in for packing of *Parliaments*; When honeſt *Magiſtrates* are every where turn'd out, and ſworn Enemies to the *Eſtabliſh'd Governments* fill their places; When we are threatned, like the *Iſraelites*, to be Chaſtized with Scorpions, and Foreign *Cut-throats* like to be let in among us; When *Religion* and *Property*, *Life* and *Poſterity*, are almoſt within the Jaws of a Gaping *Monſter*; When all the Foundations, and the whole Frame of *Government* are ſo ſhaken, that Diſſolution muſt enſue; When there is no hope left, nor any Counſel can be heard but *Jeſuites* and bigotted *Papiſts*: And to compleat all, when all Men are ſenſible, and three quarters at leaſt of the Nation are perſwaded in their Conſciences that all this is really ſo: If ever Men will ſtand up for Self-Defence, and to ſave Poſterity, *This is the Time*. When Matters are brought to this

paſs,

ſaſt, to talk of Paſſive *Obedience*, is the greateſt Nonſenſe in the World; and to tell the People of being ſubject to Authority, when there is no Authority but Illegal Force, and all the Rules and Meaſures of Government broken, is to talk to the Wind, and perſwade Men to be tamely *Murder'd* in Obedience to Illegal *Violence*. *Rebellion* in this Caſe (as they pleaſe to call it) becomes a *Duty*; and to be *Paſſive*, is to Betray the Nation. And then for the other part of the Queſtion about a *Judge*, there is none upon Earth to determine this Matter, but the *Sword*. Every Man will Judge for himſelf, and conſult as he can for his own Safety: But there lies no Appeal, but only to the Court of *Heaven* for the Succeſs of the *Cauſe*; and that Court (*God* be praiſed) has determin'd the Matter, by ſending us a *King* that Maintains our *Laws* and *Ancient Government*.

PART II.

A DEFENCE OF THE Foregoing DISCOURSE AGAINST Certain Exceptions Communicated in Writing.

SIR,

I Received your Paper of Exceptions against what I have been saying hitherto, in behalf of the present *Government*, and in Defence of the late Happy *Revolution*: But I am sorry you should trouble your self and me with so many trite and common things, which have had full and sufficient Answers *usque ad Nauseam*: However since you seem to expect it, I shall go thro' them all, and doubt not to satisfie any indifferent Person. But such as are, or seem to be under Judicial Blindness and Infatuation, may seek for Conviction by *Miracle*, if they please; and 'tis a question whether that would do it: For they do not appear to be capable of any Satisfaction, till they find it in the smart of that *Misery* and *Slavery*, which they have long been Courting and Admiring, and are now grown Impatient of Delay. But of you I hoped better things, and shall be sorry to find my self mistaken.

The

The first thing I meet with is this; *But what, I pray, if Kings misdemean themselves in their Government, must they presently cease to be Kings?*

You put this *Question*, as if you had not read what you are pretending to Answer, without taking any notice of what I quoted you from K. *James* and Mr. *Barclay*, and so you go on as if nothing at all had been said in this Matter.

Therefore I proceed to

The next thing; *God Almighty made them Kings, and how can less Authority Dethrone them?*

This is no better than pure *Sophistry*, as if *Kings* were not of Humane Race, but made in *Heaven*, and sent down upon *Earth* to devour Mortals, like so many *Frogs* to be eaten up by a *Stork* without any hopes of Deliverance. What would you think if I should advance this for an Argument, *God* makes *Merchants* and *Lawyers*; therefore *Merchants* cannot break, nor *Lawyers* prevaricate. I am sure *Kings* are not made without Means no more than other Conditions of Men: All is Providence, from the Throne to the Dunghil; and we find in Scripture *Kings* made by the *People*. Nay even Hereditary *Kings* are made by the *People* as well as *Elective*: For Crowns, at this day, are not Intail'd by Messages from *Heaven*, but by *Laws* made upon *Earth*; and I pray who made these *Laws*? Had the People no Hand in them? Historians tell us, That the Right Descent of English *Kings* has been broken now Nine times since K. *William* the First: And the Scriptures tell us, That the Lineal Succession of the *Kings* of *Israel* and *Judah* have been Interrupted and cut off, sometimes by express Nomination from *God* by a *Prophet*, and sometimes also Providentially. *Jehu*, a Subject, was Anointed *King* by a *Prophet*, *Baasha* slew *Nadab* and Succeeded in the *Kingdom*, and *Omri* was made *King* by the People without any Divine Appointment. So that here is *Jus Divinum*, the *Sword*, and the *People*, each of them setting up their several *Kings*. And in a word, all *Kings* are made and unmade by Divine Providence, which puts down one and sets up another; and we quarrel at this, and think much that God should Rule the World, unless he give us a particular Account of his Ways.

But

But suppose they do really design the Subversion of the Government, who shall or ought to punish them?

Barclay says, in that Case, the *King returns to the State of a private Man, and the People become Free and Superior.* This is so cutting a thing, especially from one of your own Party, that I suppose you durst not so much as touch it. But I Answer; None ought to punish the *King*, nor to hurt his Person, tho' he be fall'n from his Power: But I say, that when a *Government* is breaking up, and all things at the brink of Ruin and Confusion, every Man ought to stand for his Life, and to Defend his *Family* and *Posterity*, the best he can, from future *Misery*; otherwise they are guilty of Self-Murder, and of Betraying their Country, provided they be in a Condition to appear in the Field, as many Brave *Englishmen* did at *York*, and in *Cheshire*, and other places of this *Kingdom*, in *Nov.* 1688. In the mean time, the *King* is to be Counselled to keep within the Sanctuary of the Law, or at least to keep his Person out of Danger, and not to Head his Party: But if he will, against all Justice, Prudence, and Perswasions, Join with Wicked Men, and Expose himself to Blind *Bullets*, and fall in the *Field*, it is to be look't upon as an Accidental thing, and none can help it. *God* forbid that any one should think of hurting him on purpose; and Charge should be given to all to be ware as much as possible of so doing. For this, see further that Nameless, but very Learned Book, which your self put into my Hands.

You come next to your Boys Play, Give a thing and take a thing; where from a certain *Maxim* of your Learned *Politicians*, you infer, that the People have wholly and intirely divested themselves of all their *Power* and *Right*, without any Limitation whatsoever, and therefore they can by no means call for it back again.

I cannot deny at this time of Day, that a Free People may make themselves *Slaves* by Consent: There are those among us, who not only seem forward to do it, but take it ill that the whole Kingdom will not do the like. Hitherto I have thought it impossible that any Wise Man should do an Act without having some end in it; or should give up his whole Right to the *Will* of another, without any respect back again upon himself. But the *Jacobites*, whose Principles are Unaccountable, have given us a Demonstration of it, and

to

to them only are we Indebted for so Noble a Discovery. I could wish they would try the Experiment in *France*, and not trouble us here in *England*, who are under better Circumstances. Indeed those that have made an ill Bargain, must be content to stand by it, till they can be released: But we have made a good one, and will stand for it, not doubting the performance on either part. We have Sworn Allegiance to the *King*, and he has Sworn to Rule by *Law*; Allegiance and Protection are Correlatives, and will be so while this *Kingdom* stands: Take away the one, and the other falls to the Ground. But no *Scheme* of Politicks will please you, but that of *Hobbs*, or *Filmer*, which teacheth *Kings* to break through the most Sacred and Solemn *Obligations*, and to Act *Leviathan* without Controul.

Your last Argument was *Argumentum Puerile*, taken from Boys Play; the next is *Argumentum Pestiferum*, taken from the Common Pests of the Nation, as you are pleased to style the poor *Bailiffs*; and thus you express it.

As to the Power in not being resisted in the Execution of the *Laws*, which you are pleased to allow to *Kings*, if that be all they are *Kings* for; truly I think they are in a far worse state and condition than the Common Pests of the Nation, the Rogue *Bailiffs*.

But by your Favour, I did not say, that is all they are *Kings* for, but I said the *King* in Executing the Law is not to be Resisted, not denying him his proper share in the *Legislative Power*, in which none will oppose him: But if he should assume the whole Legislative Power, as some in Effect have done, that would mightily alter the Case. But besides all this, the *King* of *England* has a *Royal Prerogative*, which is not a Dispensing Power, or a Power above the *Law* to do what he pleases; but it is a Power Residing in the *King*, partly defin'd and limitted by the *Law* it self, and partly left to the *King*'s Wisdom and Clemency, to be exerted for the Benefit of the Subject, where the edge of the *Law* is too sharp, which often happens by Casualty or Humane Infirmity. For the *Law* is an Excellent *Rule*, but in many Cases it may be defeated; nor can it provide for all future Accidents. Infirmity or Knavery in Witnesses may occasion a wrong Sentence: And *Laws* can never be made so compleat, but that *Summum Jus* may happen to be *Summa Injuria*.

So that the King's Prerogative is to Relieve the Subject in Extraordinary Cases, and being used with Prudence and good Advice, is a Glorious *Jewel* of the *Crown*.

Let us now pursue the Comparison between an English *Monarch* and a *Bailiff*; There one let us View upon a *Throne*, Cloathed with Power and Excellent *Majesty*, Vested with a Noble Prerogative, and giving his Royal Assent to *Laws* made for the Punishment of Evil-doers, and for the Praise of them that do well: Or let us consider him in the Field giving *Laws* to *Princes*, Commanding many Thousands, Protecting the Innocent, Defending the *Faith*, Astonishing his Enemies, and for several Years together Defying the *Philistine*, and Desiring Nothing more than to meet him fairly in the Field. Now what is there in a *Bailiff*, to bear up the Credit of such a Comparison? He is indeed a Lawful and Necessary *Officer*, but I know not how it comes to pass that he should not only be a *Rogue*, but the Common *Pest* of the Nation. If this be a mean Character of a *Bailiff* (as I think it is) what must it be of the *King* of *England*, who (because he is not Arbitrary) is in a far worse State and Condition? This is a vile Reflection upon the English Frame of *Government*, which many Wise Men think is the best Constitution in the *World*.

But here comes the Old Killing Question, as briskly as if it had never yet been Answered; Who must be *Judge* when the *King* has a Design to Subvert the *Government*? And 'tis brought in with these Triumphant words; *You see*, Sir, *what a goodly thing you have made of your so much boasted Cause and Demonstration of Nothing.*

To this I Answer, *First*, That some People thro' *Blindness*, and others thro' *Prejudice*, are not capable of a Demonstration. *Secondly*, I will venture my Paper and yours before any Learned Men, even tho' he be a *Jacobite*, and will for once be Judged by him, whether your Cause or mine is better Managed. *Thirdly*, You have in my Paper a full Answer to this very Question; but you do so abound in your own Sense, that you could not see it; or perhaps indeed you have not read it, for haste to get my Paper Answered. I shall therefore Answer it once more with some small Improvement. I say then, these very Three Parties you mention, namely

ty, the *King*, the *People*, and a *Forreigner*, are all of them Competent *Judges* in this Matter.

For *First*, Cannot the *King* easily tell what he himself Designs to do? Certainly he is a Competent *Judge* of his own *Mind* and Intention, whether he declare it or not. K. *James* said in his First Council, he would Maintain the *Church of England*, and many well-meaning People were so simple as to believe him: Yet not long after it was declared in a private Letter (said to be his) *That he would Reduce the Kingdom to the Catholick Religion, or Die a Martyr.* But whether this be true or no, every Man certainly is a proper *Judge* of his own Intention, but he is not like to discover the same, when such Discovery may be a Means to prevent his Design.

Secondly, The People too are Judges in this Case: For cannot every Man tell what he feels, and what he fears? When a Man's *Head* is broken, or his *Goods* taken from him, he has reason to know that it is so; and his Neighbour that is a Spectator to Day, may be a Sufferer to Morrow. *Jam proximus ardet*, is *Scarborough* Warning. If a *Charter* be taken from a *Corporation*, are the People no Judges as to Matter of Fact? If the *Master* and *Fellows* of the *College* are turn'd out of their *Freehold*, must some body else Judge for them, and inform them that they want *Lodgings*? If a *Protestant Justice* of Peace be turn'd out of Commission, and a *Papist* put in his room, he certainly knows that he is not on the *Bench*, and is capable of making a Rational Judgment, not only of the Matter of Fact, but of the Consequence. If I see a *Cut-throat* Murdering my Neighbour, and then making towards me with his long *Knife*, you would have me to stay till my Throat be cut, before I must judge what his meaning is. In short, your whole drift is to make the *King* an *Idol*, and the People *Sots*.

And then *Thirdly*, As to a *Forreigner*, or Neighbouring *Prince*, 'tis very possible, that he may make as true a Judgment as any other: A By-stander sees how the Game goes better sometimes than he that plays it. And it is well that it was so in our Case of late, else you and I might have been Disputing in a Dungeon, or a worse place; for which all *Protestant* and true *Englishmen* ought to give Thanks to *God*, and next to Him, to our Gracious Deliverer, K. *William*.

William. Thus you may see, if Prejudice will permit, that after all your flourishing, each of the three Parties you except against, are, or at least may be, proper Judges in the Case before us.

But indeed I thought at first your Question had been this, *When a difference breaks out between the King and his People, who is a proper Judge to determine the matter between them?* For it is one thing to judge Rationally, and almost infallibly, when ill Designs are on foot; and another thing to judge between the Parties at odds, and to determine the Difference. As to the former, I believe that even your self did once judge that we were in an evil *Case*, and so, I am sure, did most of the *Jacobites*; and now you long to be so again, or in a worse: But in the latter Case there is no Judge upon Earth; and this I also told you before. There lies no *Appeal* but to the Court of *Heaven*, nor any way to plead the Cause, but with the *Sword*; and the God of Battel, that gives Victory, must Judge and Determine the Controversie. But this is always to be understood when all other means have been tried. "For if the Case will admit of "Intreaties, sober Counsels, or Legal Appeals, they are to be used: "But if there be no room for these, or if they take no place, but "illegal force be used; that force may, nay must be resisted, or Evil "is consented to: For he that will not serve the Publick by that "means, when there is no other, does actually consent to the ruine "of it, and is a Betrayer of his Country. *They are Rebels* (says a Learned Author) *who Arm against the Government, and not they who Arm to defend it.*

In the next place, you say, That *if a King do give Authority to Rogues, and that too under his Broad Seal, to cut any of his Subjects Throats, be they more or fewer, such Persons may resist such illegal force, in defence of their Lives, and kill their Assailants too, if they be able, and justify the same by the Establish'd* Laws *of the* Nation.

Admirably well! Right every Word. See here the force of *Truth*, that cannot be stifled under the greatest prejudice. This is all the *Resistance* I contend for. Did ever any one plead for the *Resistance* of Lawful *Authority?* No sure: It is only the *Kings* Unlawful Commands that may be resisted, not his Lawful Ones. Yet you conclude this Point with the most Comical Fancy in the World; you say, *I have brought my Hogs to a fair Market*; when on the contrary

trary you do here justify all that I have said, or can say upon this *Argument*, and you have given up your *Cause* to all intents. Since I was born, did I never see such a Conclusion from such Premises.

You seem to take exception that *I* should say, *The King is King by Law*, but you do not well explain your self, nor tell me where your Exception lies. Yet you urge that *Maxim* of the *Law*, *That the King can do no wrong*, as if it were on your side, which makes altogether as much against you; for these two Expressions are of the same importance, it being all one in effect, to say he is *King by Law*, and to say, *He can do no wrong*. For what's the reason that the *King*, being but a *Man*, can do no wrong? It is not because he does not do amiss in granting illegal Commissions; for no doubt he sins in it, and does that which is *Morally Evil*: But the reason is, because he can act nothing, *qua Rex*, but by or according to *Law*; So that unless the *Law* be wrong, the *King* can do none. From whence it naturally follows, that whatsoever the *King* does beside or Contrary to the *Law*, is not the Act of a *King* but of a private person.

Suppose, for Example, a *King* at one time Corrects a *Servant* moderately for a real Fault, at another time he beats him severely without a Cause, and the third time he kills him without any Provocation: These are none of them *Regal Acts*; for the *First* he does as Master of a *Family*; the *Second*, as a Man in *Passion*; the *Third*, as a *Tyrant*. Yet I do not say that this Tyrannical Act *Unkings* him: For one Act makes not a Habit, and 'tis possible he may repent of it, and lay it so to heart, as to become a better Man and a better *King* ever after. But this I do say, That a constant Course of *Arbitrary* Proceeding, so far as to lay aside the *Laws*, and actually Change the Government, does *Unking* him; and the reason is, because he destroys that by which he has his being; It is the *Law* makes him a *King*, which being removed and laid aside, he has no Foundation to stand upon. This I said before, and by your Favour it is not *Gratis Dictum*, as you are pleased to say, but you have Answered my paper without reading it, or at least without regarding what you Read.

Nor is this a Parallel Case with that which you put, of whipping

your *Boy* too Severely, and thereupon ceasing to be his *Father*: There is a wide difference between the Dissolution of a *Government* and the Correction of a *Child*, the one is *Destroyed* and the other *Improved*; But if you destroy your *Child*, that is, kill him by Correcting him, this will bring the Comparison nearer home. For as a *King* Ceases to be a *King* when he has destroyed his *Kingdom*: So a *Father* ceases to be a *Father* when he has no *Child*. So that your own Comparison with a little improvement makes altogether against you. Besides there is a manifest difference between a *Natural* and a *Political* Relation: The one can never be dissolved while the parties are in being, but the other may. A good *King* may happen to lose his *Kingdom* and remain in Exile, that I know you'l readily grant: But he that Succeeds him in the Administration of *Sovereign power* is *King*, at least *de Facto*, and the *Law* requires *Allegiance* to be paid him, so that the former relation Ceases. But this puts me in mind to recommend to you Sr. *Ro. Filmers*, Political *Babel*, whereof this is the Corner Stone, *that we are all born Slaves, and that a Son, a Subject, a Servant and a Slave, are all one, without any Difference*. If you are not yet acquainted with that worthy *Author*, its great pity you should not, for I believe you would greatly admire him.

You tell me next, To bring the Authority of K. *James* the First is all over *Jargon*, with a great deal more to the same purpose; where you make Reflections upon that Learned *King*, so shameful, and so false, that it will be a kindness to you to suppress them. I shall only hint at Two Things, and pass on. *First*, You suppose, that these imprudent Sayings, (as you imprudently call them) were spoken to Court the People at his coming to the *Crown*, and you will find them in the Ninth Year of his Reign. *Secondly*, This is the first time that I have heard the Cause of our *Civil Wars*, and the Crime of K. *Charles's Murder*, laid at his Door. Further think with submission to better Judgments, that if his *Cautions* had been observed, it might have been a means to prevent the *Evils* following.

You approve, it seems, of those Determinations made in Parliament at several times, namely, under Q. *Elizabeth*, K. *James* the First, and K. *Charles* the First, with the Judgment of *Archbishop*

Laud,

Lord, according as I set it down before; for you say you cannot but grant it very *Lawful*. And I tell you once more, you have intirely given up your *Cause*; for I cannot understand how any thing can go higher in Defence of the Late *Revolution*. But you go on with the greatest Confidence in the World, saying, It was to suppress a *Rebellion* begun by the Subjects; *Cujus contrarium verum est*, it was to stop the *Incroachments* of *Princes* upon their *Subjects*. But this it is to write before you read; the words are these, *When a Prince breaks in upon the Religion and Liberties of his People, they ought to stand up in their own Defence, and may also Call in a Neighbour to their Assistance*. This you may find upon Record, and taken notice of by several Learned Men of late. See especially the *Protestant Mark*, supposed to be written by Dr. C.

In the next place you falsifie my words; to make me speak what I was not thinking of; and you jumble together a deal of *Nonsense*, and would have me to own it; concluding with your usual *Confidence*, *This you'l say your self* (I suppose) *needs no Confutation*. So indeed I do, and with very good Reason; for 'tis your own *Stuff*, and none of mine. And thus it follows;

You cannot but Wonder that a Man of my parts, &c. Should make no Difference betwixt a people Rebelling against their Lawful King, and a people Rebelling against God, when there is no such passage to be found, nor any thing like it. My words are these; *So long as a King remains a King, and Maintains the Law, he is a Rebel that opposes him: But when he falls from that, he is a Rebel himself*. For this I quoted the place (as may be seen) 1 *Sam.* 5. 12. where *Samuel* Charges *Saul*, with *Rebellion*. And I now add, that a *King* of *England* is as much obliged to Govern by *Law*, as the *King* of *Israel* was to observe *God's Commands*. As for the Story of *Abdeck*, it is only touch upon to bring in *Samuel's* severe Reproof and *Davids* taking *Arms* against him.

But say you, *Saul* was at that Instant rejected from his *Kingdom*. What trifling is this! He was *King* so long as he liv'd, and *David* was his Subject, never pretending to the *Crown* in his life time, yet he took *Arms* to defend himself; And his behaviour towards *Saul* is a good Example both ways; Namely, of Dutiful respect towards the *King*, in sparing his *Person* and giving him Honour and Reve-

 rence

rence. And at the same time in taking care of his own *Life* and *Security*.

I agree with you, that all possible Respect should be paid to the Persons of *Kings*: But I would not have them flattered, nor taught to be *Arbitrary*. I would not have them told that *Subjects* have nothing of their own, not so much as their *Souls*; that they are only the *Kings Vassals* and *Slaves*, and that he may take their Lives and seiz their Fortunes at his pleasure; that *God* made *Kings*, and no body can unmake them, nor ought to oppose them, whatever they do: such *Flattery* and *Sycophantry* makes *Kings* first aspire, and then tumble.

I come now to a *Greek Word*, which is here employ'd to no purpose, but only to shew that you are a *Learn'd Man*, which I knew before: And here you affront the plain Letter of the Scripture, being in such hast that you could not turn to the place I quoted. I shall wonder no more at your insulting over me, when the *Word of God* cannot be quiet for you.

The business was this: Whereas the *Jacobites* love to call us *Rebels*, I undertook to shew that there was a sinless *Rebellion*, and that the word was not always taken in an ill sence; for this I quoted 2 *Kings* 18. 7. where it was said *the Lord was with him*, (viz. *Hezekiah*) *and he* Rebelled *against the King of* Assyria, *and served him not*; and you say it was not certainly *Rebellion*: Now whether must [illegible], or the *Scripture*, carry it? If you had said this is not [illegible], then you had come to an Agreement with [illegible] that matter, and there needed no words about it; but that you [illegible] I am to be run down at any rate, and that with [illegible] when you have not said one word to refute me. And all [illegible], that when you have the least to say, you are the most [illegible]. I conclude this in the *Style* which you except against; *So the People of* England *Rebelled against K.* James, *for God was with them.*

I now draw near to the *Conclusion* of your Paper, where after many Windings and Doubles, like a *Hare* run almost to Death, I find you where we started, namely, at the *Act forbidding to Arm against the King, upon any pretence whatsoever.* I gave you four Reasons at large to shew that these words could not possibly be understood

derſtood without a tacit *Reſervation*: Nor have you offer'd ought that looks like an *Anſwer* to any of them.

The *Firſt* you have quite omitted. To the *Second*, you have only brought a Compariſon between an *Engliſh Monarch* and a *Bailiff*, ſhewing that the *King* is by great odds the worſe Man of the two. The *Third* you have fairly yielded, and therein given up your Cauſe. To the *Fourth*, you take Exception that I ſhould ſay, *The King is King by Law*; and yet you own the Maxim, *That the King can do no Wrong*. And now after all (ſuſpecting perhaps your Weakneſs and Inconſiſtence hitherto) you come to offer ſomething that looks at firſt ſight like a *Dilemma*, but unfortunately it wants one of its *Members*, which it ſeems you have dropt in great precipitation.

The ſubſtance of the matter is this: *Either the Parliament did conſider the Conſequenſe of making ſuch a Law, or they did not*: *If not*, (ſay you) *they were a Club of* Blockheads *and meer* Loggerheads. Very good! Here's the Conſequence of that. But what if the *Parliament* did conſider, what then? Why then (you ſay) *you have in a few words run through all I have ſaid in this Cauſe*: An admirable Conſequence, and a rare *Dilemma*! The one is lame of a ſide, and the other is *falſe*, unleſs you have run through my Papers with ſome ſmall *Needle*, which I cannot perceive.

But let us Come once more to the Merits of the *Cauſe*; I grant the *Parliament* might, and I believe they did conſider the Conſequences of both ſides, that is, with reſpect to the *King* and the People. And tho' 'tis poſſible they might compute amiſs, yet I rather incline to thinke they did not: For Either they muſt Speak in General *terms*, or elſe they muſt make ſome Limitation or Exception. Now there is no Exception to be made, but only this, In caſe the *King* ſhould become a *Tyrant*, and Endeavour to Subvert the *Goverment*: But how ſhameful and dangerous a thing muſt it have been to mention ſuch a thing in an *Act* of *Parliament*! It might have provoked the *King* to Diſſolve them, or it might have prepared the people for a new *Rebellion*. So that ſuppoſing it neceſſary to paſs ſuch an *Act*, it muſt of Neceſſity paſs in general *Terms*, tho' it may ſeem hard upon the people: But it is not hard upon them at all, being underſtood in ſuch a Senſe as to be Conſiſtent with other *Laws*: And either it muſt be ſo underſtood or it does Actually

change

change the *Government*, and gives the *King* a deſpotick *Power*, which that the *Parliament* did ever deſign, is Nonſenſe to Imagine.

I am now at the foot of the Account, and you think you have given me a full Anſwer, deſiring me to look once more over my Papers, and tell you, if you are not Miſtaken in your Anſwers. I have told you already, and now I tell you again, that you are mightily miſtaken, and I ſhall never be made to think otherwiſe. I have lookt over my Papers, and yours too, ſeveral times, which you I believe, have not done once, or if at all, I am ſure without due Conſideration. But you were ſo Ambitious to anſwer my Papers all at one Sitting, that you had far better have let it alone. Many things you have left Untoucht, and thoſe you have, are no worſe for your handling. Amongſt the reſt, I wonder you have taken no Notice of what I quoted you out of the famous *Barclay*, ſo great an Aſſerter of *Monarchy*, that he is Reckoned the head of your party; And yet no writing that I have ſeen has determined this point more directly againſt you. You have Ruffled the Memory of his *Royal Maſter* with a witneſs, and 'tis ſtrange that he alſo ſhould not come in for a Caſt of your *Office*.

To conclude, Sir, If I were worthy to adviſe you, I ſhould deſire that you would forbear idle company, and not ſpend your Money on thoſe that poiſon and corrupt you; that you would think more, and talk leſs, and read with conſideration ſuch Books as are written on this ſubject by *Men* of the greateſt Learning and Piety, and particularly that which you ſent me; that you would ſcribble no more in this manner *quicquid in Buccam venerit*, and think with your ſelf whether you be fit to cope with the greateſt Men in *England*: For I have ſaid nothing here, but what ſuch have ſaid before me, tho not in the ſame words, yet in far better. However, being *challeng'd* at firſt, and now again *Urg'd* with ſo much *Confidence* and *Triumph*, I would not wholly decline the *Argument*, and doubt not to defend it againſt the beſt of your *Party*. I call it your *Party*, but *I* hope I ſhall have occaſion to retract that expreſſion; for *I* remember the time you were of another Opinion, and do expect to find you ſo again: For I am perſwaded it is not of your own

proper

proper *Genius* that you are what you are, or what you seem to be at present; but by having sometimes your Conversation amongst Men of *Slavish, Debauch'd and Pernicious* Principles: And this is the Case of a great many more, that were once well-affected to the present *Government*. But you have had the Advantage of a Generous *Education*, and your Learning is beyond many of your Profession, which also is one of the most *Honourable* and most *Loyal*: For, but few of your *Brethren* Comparatively are *Jacobites*. Be not you (I beseech you) toss'd to and fro with every wind of *Doctrine*, nor led away with the prating *Confidence* of Pragmatick *Fellows*. Consider what a parcel of *Atheists* and Profligates weigh, being laid in the Ballance against the Church of *England*, and other Reformed Churches, together with that vast Body of *Nobility, Gentry, Lawyers*, and Substantial *Commoners* of the *Kingdom*. They are but like the *Vermine* in the *Fable* that would needs swell to the bigness of an *O X*. And they may burst themselves with their own Poison if they please, the *Government* does not care a Straw for 'em, nor do I fear that ever they will be able to hurt it. And so Fare you well.

F I N I S.